subject-matter of the *professiones* was property. This is revealed in Cicero's statement to Tiro: "haec pecunia ex eo genere est ut professione non egeat," in which *pecunia* is the regular word for property, especially in its relation to the census.[1] What, now, was the purpose of the returns? Being made annually and relating to property, they were evidently required by the government for the sake of the information they contained. In other words, they were census returns to be used as the basis of administration. The significance of this is that similar *professiones* are provided for in Caesar's Municipal Law. If, then, Cicero is referring in the two letters to some legislation of Caesar, it must be to this. Unless we are willing (as some critics seem to be) to substitute mere possibilities for known and admitted facts, no other conclusion is possible. With this connection firmly established, it is possible to proceed to some interesting and valuable conclusions, among them, the hitherto unrecognized fact that Caesar completely reorganized the Roman census.

JEFFERSON ELMORE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

HORACE, *SERMONES* ii. 1. 34–39

Sequor hunc, Lucanus an Apulus anceps,
nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus,
missus ad hoc, pulsis, vetus est ut fama, Sabellis,
quo ne per vacuum Romano incurreret hostis,
sive quod Apula gens seu quod Lucania bellum
incuteret violenta.

The general sense of this passage is clear enough; the particular purpose Horace had in mind in writing this apparent digression (note the resumptive *sed* in 39) has been admirably stated by Wickham. But editors have long felt difficulty over one detail, *quo ne* (37). It will suffice to cite the unsatisfactory notes of two of the most recent editors of the *Sermones*. In 1909 Professor Morris wrote on *quo ne* only the following words: "for *ut ne* or *ut eo ne;* but this use of *quo* is without a parallel." In 1910 Heinze, in Kiessling, *Q. Horatius Flaccus Satiren*[4], printed this note: "*quo ne* singulär für *ut eo ne*, idem *eo* im Sinne *ea re* das voraufgegangene *missus ad hoc* wieder aufnimmt: 'damit auf diese Weise nicht. . . . .'"

For a very much better discussion of the passage we may turn to the note in Arthur Palmer's edition of the *Satires*. Professor Palmer also suggested a perfectly simple explanation of the passage, though he did not, in my judgment, make as good a defense of his suggestion as it is easily possible

---

[1] Cf. Cic. *Leg.* iii. 3. 7; Livy xxix. 37. 7; *Lex Iulia municipalis* v. 147; Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, p. 222.

to make. He regarded *quo* as the relative pronoun, with its antecedent in *Venusinus . . . . colonus* (35), and he construed it as ablative of separation with *vacuum*, though he translated rather carelessly by "through a space unguarded by him." I have never been able to see why so simple an explanation has been persistently neglected, and why in its stead competent scholars have preferred to foist upon Horace a combination which they admit to be without a parallel. If one looks at the passage carefully, he sees that in 37, even if he accepts the view of Heinze and Morris, he must supply with *vacuum*, as its *necessary* complement, some word in the ablative suggesting persons and equivalent logically to *defensoribus*. Since this is inevitable, why not find that complement in *quo*, and thus at the same time find an easy explanation of that word, in logic and in syntax both? For all this one finds a perfect parallel in Horace himself:

> si cui praeterea validus male filius in re
> praeclara sublatus aletur, ne manifestum
> caelibis obsequium nudet te, leniter in spem
> adrepe officiosus, ut et scribare secundus
> heres, et, si quis casus puerum egerit Orco,
> in vacuum venias. . . . . [*Serm.* ii. 5. 45–50]

How can one interpret at all here unless he supplies *eo = filio* with *vacuum?* If he does that, he has a perfect parallel to *Serm.* ii. l. 37, *quo ne*, as interpreted above.

This parallel Professor Palmer did not cite. He referred only to Ovid *Met.* 7. 653, *vacuos cultoribus agros.* But there are many parallels, in fact, for *vacuus* construed with an ablative word dependent on it which suggests a person or persons. Compare e.g., Caesar, *B.G.* vii. 45. 7: "Vacua castra hostium Caesar conspicatus" (the departure of the enemy had been stated in 5); *Aen.* vi. 269: "perque domos Ditis vacuas et inania regna"; *Aen.* ii. 528 and vii. 379: *vacua atria; Aen.* ii. 761: *porticibus vacuis;* Juvenal iii. 2–3: "laudo tamen, vacuis quod sedem figere Cumis destinet atque unum civem donare Sibyllae"; Horace *Epp.* i. 7. 45: *vacuum Tibur,* and i. 7. 49–51: "conspexit . . . . adrasum quendam vacua tonsoris in umbra cultello proprios purgantem leniter ungues" (see Morris's notes *ad loc.*). In all these passages and in others it is the absence of human beings that *vacuus* connotes.

Finally, to make entirely clear the interpretation supported above, I add a rendering of ii. l. 38–39: "sent out, after the expulsion of the Sabines, so story says, for this very purpose, that the foe might not make raids on the Romans across land empty of him." An affirmative rendering would be at once less awkward and clearer: "that he might fill up the land and so keep the foe from making raids across it on the Romans."

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY